

Your study is fatally flawed because it is all about profitability, market share, coverage, diversity, scope of ownership, media substitution, and etc. You actually have the gall to argue that the proposed loosening of regulations will encourage competition -- Like it has in the past?

It is what your study does not address that is the crux of the matter. Such as:

1. Conflict of interest by corporations with major holdings in other areas besides a single media; e.g. nuclear power, telephone, turbines, computers, refineries, railroads, theme parks, billboards, real estate, financial institutions, cable, TV stations, networks. Numerous media moguls are on record that media is a business subsidiary of other holdings, and as such, shall be used to help (but never to hurt) profitability. This is self-censorship and institutionalized spin on a scale the founding fathers could never have imagined.

2. Depth and scope of coverage. Why did the clearly illegal dealings in the Florida 2000 presidential election go almost unreported by every major network in the United States? This is the tip of an ugly and conspiratorial group censorship iceberg.

3. Your study treated all particular media types as equals; hence, a local college radio station was given the same weight as a major network. Where is the research on the scope of the listening audience for a given market?

I no longer hear open, reasoned, rational, two-sided discussions on any of the major networks. The lack of in-depth research and coverage has become the mainstay of 'profitable' media.

Remember your oath of office Mike? It is not your job to protect corporate profitability or acquisition rights. It is your job to protect the public airwaves against "all enemies, foreign and domestic." To whom is your allegiance sir -- to corporate America or to the American people?